

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEE CONCERNS RELATING TO
PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

As a result of decisions made in January 1974, the Agency affirmed a personnel system based upon (1) comparative evaluation as the basis for promotion, assignment, and career development, and (2) a clear delineation of responsibilities between the Career Services and the Office of Personnel, as now embodied in the Regulations. In implementing their part of the system, the Career Services have published Handbooks that have become a major means of communicating to the employee just what personnel policies and procedures are.

The Office of Personnel is now receiving inputs concerning the functioning of this system both from the employees and from management. A large and highly representative sampling of the Agency's employees was conducted during July-August 1976; the results are now being analyzed but several distinct problem areas--from the employee's viewpoint--have been identified. In the same time frame, the recently appointed DDCI identified in August 1976 seven problem areas in the personnel field--from management's viewpoint--for staffing and for discussion in the EAG. Measures to improve personnel policies and procedures must be responsive both to management and employee perceptions in the interests of improving the effectiveness of the total organization.

Another input has been received from a series of discussions held during September 22 with personnel and management officers

25X1

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

The DDCI identified in his memo of 19 August 1976 the following problem areas: (1) the mechanism for selecting key operating officials of the Agency; (2) the purposes and procedures for identifying the lowest ranking categories in comparative evaluation and the uneven administration of these among the respective services; (3) the need for a structured approach toward inter-Directorate rotation; (4) the responsiveness of the promotion process to demonstrated excellence; (5) the effectiveness of measures to achieve equal opportunity employment; (6) establishment of the proper mix and balance of personnel among components; (7) aptness of initial assignment and orientation of new employees. These will be discussed in the first part of this study and followed by recommendations.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

recognition as Quality Step Increases; (7) confusion concerning circumstances and procedures governing separation; (8) various external and internal factors affecting morale within the Agency; and, perhaps a major problem area, (9) the role, utilization, and recognition of women. These will be discussed summarily in Part Two and also in a separate report on the results of the survey.

PART ONE

Problem Areas Identified by Management

1. Selection of key operating officials.

In current practice, key operating officials are selected without referral to a review body to assure that qualified candidates have been considered on an Agency-wide basis. In many government agencies and private corporations, comparable positions would be filled after organization-wide evaluation of those comparatively few persons qualified to compete. The Agency's own Personnel Approaches Study Group (PASG) concluded in 1973 that an Agency-level mechanism should review nominations to fill senior openings. Indeed, the charter of the former Management Committee did authorize it to review nominations for key operating positions, but this practice was never observed. In view of the new charters for the DDCI and for the Executive Advisory Group, this function could now be assigned to the EAG or a subcommittee thereof with the further stipulation that it be informed as soon as it is known that a key operating position is to become vacant.

2. Identification of lowest ranked individuals.

It is Agency policy that the Career Services use comparative evaluation to identify those employees with the least potential and to initiate appropriate career action (counseling or training) or other administrative action. In implementing this policy,

25X1A

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

Career Services follow a variety of procedures, which may result in disparate treatment of employees, depending on the Career Service in which they find themselves. From the beginning, problems have arisen from an emphasis on low potential for the selection of the lowest ranked employees. An employee could be doing a perfectly adequate job yet demonstrate low potential for further advancement; should he then be classified as lowest ranked? In an effort to correct this, an inter-Career Service task force recommended the use of uniform descriptors for use by all Career Services. The lowest ranked category was additionally defined in terms of employees whose performance and potential are substandard in comparison with others of the same grade and occupational category. Employees whose performance met the standard would not ordinarily be put in the low category.

Generally, the Career Services place their emphasis in the first instance on counseling the substandard rather than separation, and in this they reflect the emphasis placed by the Personnel Approaches Study Group that established the current procedures.

The DDO uses a primary zone and a secondary zone as trip mechanisms for counseling and possible subsequent administrative action. An employee who falls within the primary zone (bottom 5 percent) is warned, and if then in the following year he falls within the secondary zone (bottom 3 percent) he is subject to administrative action.

The DDA does not define a service-wide trip zone. Its handbook states that comparative evaluation is to "identify those employees with the least potential and to initiate appropriate career action

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

(e.g., counseling or training) or adverse action (e.g., separation or downgrading.)"

The DDS&T's identification of the lowest ranking applies to the bottom 10 percent. Those in the bottom 10 percent "whose performance is judged to be unsatisfactory" will be notified of this in writing.

The handbook for the E Career Service does not specify a policy with respect to selection-out nor does it refer to notification of those who are low ranked.

The DDI identifies the bottom 3 percent group "by determining those who are judged least valuable to the continued successful completion of the mission of the area(s) or function(s) covered by that panel." Provision is made for notification and for appeal.

There are ambiguities and a lack of uniformity in the procedures. What is the relative weight of poor performance, poor potential for advancement, and low value to the completion of the mission? How are these determined? According to preliminary processing of the July 1976 attitude survey, only 48 percent of the employees believe they understand the difference between being selected-out and being declared surplus. (Forty-five percent do not understand this difference). There is greater confusion with respect to the criteria employed. Sixty-three percent do not understand how people are identified for selection-out while only 30 percent do. Even in the DDO, which has had an ongoing program longer than the other Directorates, 52 percent do not understand the criteria for selection-out.

CONFIDENTIAL

The courts have long been sympathetic to the need to prune the employee ranks in the need to stimulate productivity and effectiveness. At the same time they have supported administrative procedures that afford proper protection to individual rights, safeguard against bias and discrimination in application, and assure fairness of treatment.

In contrast to the Civil Service, where employees in the classified service have tenure and have procedural rights with respect to tenure, and to the Foreign Service, where Foreign Service Officers have been denied tenure by the Foreign Service Act but do have procedural safeguards after court precedents, employees of the Agency serve under the condition that the Director is empowered to terminate the employment of any Agency employee when he determines that such action is necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Those regulations that govern administrative separation [REDACTED]

25X1A

25X1A

[REDACTED] lack details with regard to procedures for selection-out.

There are management reasons why the Agency may wish to make greater use of administrative separation in the interests of increasing the accessions of qualified professionals within ceiling and helping the promotion rates while removing the less productive members of its workforce. Too many of the present tools, i.e., surplus exercises, however, relate to the encouragement of early retirement and actually result in the loss of highly qualified members of the workforce.

If greater use is to be made of administrative separation, the procedures must be in conformity with court precedents; the policies must be explicit and carefully thought out with respect to criteria,

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

and objectives; the productive employee must not view the procedures as threatening; and the priority given to counseling should be maintained.

3. A structured approach toward inter-Directorate rotation.

A significant amount of rotation has occurred in the Agency but usually it occurs as a result of searching for a man qualified to fill a position that has just become available, and not as a result of the career planning that identifies individuals who would benefit from a tour in another Directorate.

There are different kinds of rotations:

- ° Rotation for the development of the individual, including those identified as possible "successors" for senior grades and those who are in senior grades who can benefit from cross-fertilization.
- ° Functional specialists rotating to exercise their skills in different organizations as required.
- ° Out-of-Directorate assignment to unanticipated job openings that must be filled from the list of available personnel possessing the necessary qualifications.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

Rotations of the latter two types appear to be the most common. During FY 1975, only 50 rotational assignments were for developmental purposes while 96 were to meet needs for skills.

Rotation on the employee's initiative is relatively difficult and beset with obstacles. In response to the survey question, "Is there adequate opportunity to transfer among the various Directorates in the Agency?," 52 percent responded negatively and only 20 percent affirmatively. From the employee's view, greater ease of rotation provides increased likelihood of finding a greener pasture or a more satisfying job. In a compartmented Agency, however, there are informational obstacles that are made more intense by the division into five Career Services. The Inter-Directorate Careers Committee is one attempt to reduce these obstacles.

Management also could benefit from a more structured approach to rotations. Though the number of rotations has been exceeding expectations (146 in FY 1975 compared to expectation of 114), only 50 of these were developmental, involving persons identified for rotation. The PDP is the primary tool in any effort to increase this number.

In addition, it should be possible to designate a few positions, mostly staff, to be filled through rotational assignment. A corps of senior staff men, moving through such rotational assignments, can provide valuable assistance to management through their perceptions of the interlinkages in the Agency and can provide a quick means of

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

communication when the need arises. Within the DDA, a new system is being structured in which each Office designates at least one job for rotational assignment from another Office. Such a system might be expanded.

(Table 1 on FY 1975 Rotations follows)

4. The responsiveness of the promotion process to demonstrated excellence.

A review of data for FY 1976 covering promotions to grades 14, 15 and 16 (selected as a sample) revealed the average time in grade of those promoted was more than four years, but that some 10 percent of those promoted had been in grade fewer than two years. Recent conversations with management officials from private corporations reveal that these data are comparable with corporate practice. One might conclude that a reasonable amount of fast-tracking is occurring.

Of course, such data tell nothing concerning the quality of the promotion judgments. Yet, the career board approach to comparative evaluation provides potentially an excellent basis for assessment and is one that is widely applied in industry now.

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

25X9

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

25X1A

The promulgation of clear explanations of the procedures for assessing employees and promoting them is a responsibility of the Career Services, under but the employees have poor perceptions of the fairness of the promotion process. In response to the survey question, "Do you think that promotions are given fairly in your Career Service?," thirty-four percent were affirmative, thirty-five percent negative, and the rest uncertain.

The most complete explanation has been given by the DIO, which basis its promotions on assessment of primary factors (quality and level of performance, growth potential, and personal qualifications and characteristics) and secondary factors (conduct and suitability, the nature and type of service, training assignments, rotation assignments, medical and security information, and the quality of reports). It has published detailed specifications of the qualifications that must be met to be promoted, according to grade and function.

The other Career Services have been more perfunctory, generally relying on career subgroups (Offices) to publish more detailed explanations. The DDI states that performance is the primary determinant for promotion. Promotions are made only after the individual has demonstrated clearly the ability to perform effectively at the grade level to be achieved, but sometimes are limited by headroom.

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

The DDA makes a similar statement. The DDS&T states that promotions are made after clear demonstration of qualification for the next higher grade and with consideration of past performance, productivity, and skill qualifications. Competitive evaluation and ranking is an input and time-in-grade is a factor. The E Service states that promotion is based on: the assessment by the head of office or staff that the employee has demonstrated the ability and motivation to perform at the higher grade level; the competitive evaluation; assignment to a position not more than two grades above the proposed grade or, if a position lower than the proposed grade, governed by PRA stipulations; and the supervisor's recommendation.

Where the promotion recommendations flow from panels that use explicit rating systems, the employees at least know the relative importance of the factors that are assessed and, more importantly, that the promotions do result from a systematized assessment process. The same elements of assessment should be reflected in the planning for executive development and in the inclusion of individuals in the PDP.

There is considerable variation in the rating systems that do exist and in the relative importance attached to the specified criteria. There is no problem in this if a validation effort has been made. In some cases, however, the job-relatedness of the criteria and of their weighting is obscure.

(Table 2 on Promotion Data Follows)

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

25X9

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

5. The effectiveness of measures to achieve equal opportunity employment.

The Director of Personnel in July provided the signal that Black professional EODs for the first five months of CY 1976 were fewer than those for the comparable period of CY 1975. An intensive recruiting effort was not achieving the desired consequences. It was apparent that high level attention would be required to assure that promising candidates were properly and expeditiously placed. Accordingly, the DDCI has taken remedial action instructing the Deputy Directors and Heads of Independent Offices each to designate a Coordinator for Minority Employment vested with the necessary authority and accountability to work with an Agency-level Coordinator for Minority Employment who will be a senior officer in the Office of Personnel. The OP Coordinator will acquire information on requirements, match this against the candidates, and refer promising candidates to the appropriate Coordinators for subsequent discussions concerning their merits. The Coordinators will conduct the necessary discussions within their appropriate organizations so that an expeditious decision can be made to bring in a minority applicant for interview or to put such an applicant into process. A procedure has also been established to resolve any disagreements concerning the employment action to be taken.

6. Establishment of the proper mix and balance of personnel among components.

Within a component, the manager must exercise his function of management budgeting. He must determine how best to allocate the resources of personnel, materials, tools, and facilities.

The same problem exists at the top levels of Agency management, where decisions must be made that determine the allocations of resources to Directorates. As resources of money and personnel are limited, decisions must be made as to program priorities, and the effectiveness of resource utilization must be evaluated.

With respect to personnel, where should the manpower control function be exercised?

In large corporations, it is not uncommon to find manpower control exercised as follows:

- A manpower resources committee, with the corporate president as chairman, formulates policy relating to the acquisition, development, deployment, and utilization of the company's manpower resources, and periodically reports on the status of overall manpower resources.
- Division (Directorate) heads are responsible for implementing company-wide manpower resources policy and manpower planning procedures within their organizations.
- The corporate manpower planning unit is responsible for proposing manpower resources policy and plans, establishing procedures for implementing the plans, monitoring and reporting of plan execution, developing improved manpower planning techniques, and counseling and assisting the divisions on plans and problems.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

- ° Division personnel units provide division management with staff services relating to manpower planning.

While many elements of such a system exist in the Agency, there is no equivalent to the manpower resources committee. As a result, there is no high level review of the balance of manpower resources except that occurring as an outgrowth of program review, which focuses more on the budgetary aspects than the manpower aspects.

As salary costs drive so much of the Agency budget, the management concern is that effective and productive use is made of personnel and that the manpower allocations stemming from the budget process support effective use of personnel, neither providing gluts for nonessential uses nor shortages in priority tasks.

An immediate problem is that of determining the present uses of personnel in the Agency. Though the occupational mix is known, less is known about how that mix is targeted and how it divides between line and support functions.

The next problem is to study the dynamics of change in the types and uses of personnel in order better to understand where management intervention might be required so that the limited manpower resources may be optimally employed.

Finally, it may be useful to establish a review point so that the necessary adjustments in the allocations of manpower might be made.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

7. Aptness of initial assignment and orientation of new employees.

The whole recruiting and placement process is geared to get the "right person for the right job" but we know the process does not always go smoothly. The individual may be hired for a career prospect that is brighter than the initial assignment. The new employee may have had only a vague notion or even a misconception about the nature of the work in the first assignment because of security considerations or because the applicant was placed in process before it was known exactly what position would become open. The supervisor becomes the critical link in the initial assignment; if he does not take his responsibilities for on-the-job training and orientation seriously, the new employee may feel disoriented or poorly utilized.

The selecting/assigning of professional and technical personnel is decentralized, with components unilaterally making the hire/no hire decisions via the Skills Bank review system. Conversely, almost all of the clerical selections and placements are determined by the Clerical Staffing Branch based on stated component requirements and applicant qualifications. From the standpoint of qualifications, it would appear either that the Agency has done an excellent selection job or that supervisors have not exercised their responsibilities for assessment. In the last five calendar years the total number of resignations in lieu of separation for failure to qualify in the first year trial period has ranged from 0 in 1973 to 4 in 1975.

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

We have lost one major source of feedback. At one time, the OP/Professional Placement and Clerical Staffing Branches conducted follow-up interviews with new Agency employees (at one- and three-year post-EOD intervals with professional/technicians and at a one-year interval with clericals) but those programs were suspended indefinitely two to three years ago when both branches were seriously understaffed and could cope only with more essential activities. In the absence of this source, some insights can be gleaned from the responses to the July-August 1976 survey of employee attitudes; the survey breaks out the responses of both new and junior employees.

Plans Staff has analyzed some of the PME Survey responses pertinent to the question of the placement and the job satisfaction of newly hired employees. Additionally, we have noted a comparison between CIA and other agencies of the Government on these same questions.

It was assumed that employees of less than four years service, between the grades 5 and 11, college-educated and younger than 35, would be representative of those persons alluded to in the statement of the problem.

25X9

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

10 CONFIDENTIAL

<u>Question</u>		<u>%Yes</u>	<u>%No</u>
Are you making good use of your skills and abilities on your job?	CSC (Total)	68	19
	CIA (Total)	77	16
	Employee Less than 4 yrs	(70)	(22)
	Grades 5 to 11	(70)	(22)
	College Educated	(77)	(15)
	Age 25 and below	(71)	(20)
	Age 26-34	(76)	(17)
Are you doing the kind of work that you like to do?	CSC (Total)	67	19
	CIA (Total)	74	17
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(62)	(23)
	Grades 5 to 11	(65)	(23)
	College Educated	(77)	(15)
	Age 25 and below	(56)	(23)
	Age 26-34	(72)	(19)
Are you given enough work to do?	CSC (Total)	88	06
	CIA (Total)	87	11
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(85)	(12)
	Grades 5 to 11	(83)	(13)
	College Educated	(87)	(11)
	Age 25 and below	(85)	(10)
	Age 25-34	(84)	(13)
Are you given too much work to be able to do a good job?	CSC (Total)	26	57
	CIA (Total)	14	80
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(10)	(83)
	Grades 5 to 11	(12)	(83)
	College Educated	(15)	(75)
	Age 25 and below	(08)	(87)
	Age 25-34	(14)	(80)
Do you have enough say in how to do your work?	CSC (Total)	67	20
	CIA (Total)	79	15
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(76)	(11)
	Grades 5 to 11	(77)	(13)
	College Educated	(86)	(08)
	Age 25 and below	(76)	(12)
	Age 26-34	(81)	(09)
Are you encouraged to develop your skills and abilities?	CSC (Total)	59	27
	CIA (Total)	67	25
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(70)	(23)
	Grades 5 to 11	(64)	(28)
	College Educated	(69)	(22)
	Age 25 and below	(69)	(25)
	Age 26-34	(70)	(24)

<u>Question</u>		<u>%Yes</u>	<u>%No</u>
Are you able to get the training you need to do your job well?	CSC (Total)	62	22
	CIA (Total)	72	13
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(72)	(12)
	Grades 5 to 11	(68)	(15)
	College Educated	(75)	(11)
	Age 25 and below	(70)	(12)
	Age 26-34	(72)	(14)
Do you have adequate opportunity to gain experience and training for higher level work?	CSC (Total)	46	38
	CIA (Total)	51	35
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(49)	(34)
	Grades 5 to 11	(42)	(42)
	College Educated	(57)	(27)
	Age 25 and below	(47)	(36)
	Age 26-34	(52)	(33)
Are you pretty well informed of how you are doing on the job?	CSC (Total)	53	32
	CIA (Total)	67	26
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(65)	(29)
	Grades 5 to 11	(64)	(29)
	College Educated	(67)	(25)
	Age 25 and below	(64)	(30)
	Age 26-34	(65)	(27)
Is your pay fair for the job you do?	CSC (Total)	54	33
	CIA (Total)	65	27
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(58)	(32)
	Grades 5 to 11	(58)	(33)
	College Educated	(70)	(23)
	Age 25 and below	(56)	(33)
	Age 26-34	(64)	(28)
Are you given credit when you do a job well?	CSC (Total)	55	28
	CIA (Total)	72	19
	Employed Less than 4 yrs	(72)	(18)
	Grades 5 to 11	(69)	(22)
	College Educated	(75)	(15)
	Age 25 and below	(69)	(22)
	Age 26-34	(73)	(18)

The total Agency responses are generally gratifying both by themselves and in comparison with CSC results. Although CIA responses from the younger, newer, and junior employees were somewhat less positive than the total group this is not necessarily meaningful. Since we could not,

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

for example, cull out clerical employees as a group, nor those in the lower-middle grades who served there a long time, it's quite possible these groups could impact heavily on the results in a negative direction. The response pattern to Question 2, however, does raise some question as to how well the Agency deals with the young non-college educated new employee.

25X9

Additional data follow:

JOB-RELATED VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

		<u>FY 1975 Percentage</u>	<u>FY 1976 Percentage</u>	<u>Net Change Percentage</u>
Grade	: GS-02-04	11.4%	13.5%	+ 2.1%
	GS-05-07	38.7%	42.9%	+ 4.2%
	GS-08-10	18.1%	16.1%	- 2.0%
	GS-11-13	20.3%	18.1%	- 2.2%
Subcategory	: Professional	41.0%	37.8%	- 3.2%
	Technical	7.9%	4.9%	- 3.0%
	Clerical	50.1%	55.5%	+ 5.4%
Sex	: Male	58.4%	39.6%	-18.8%
	Female	41.6%	60.4%	+18.8%
Common Factors:				
	Immediate Duties & Responsibilities	16.8%	7.9%	- 8.9%
	Change Type of Employment	34.6%	60.1%	+25.5%
	Advancement	17.2%	14.1%	- 3.1%
	Career Change	21.9%	14.8%	- 7.1%

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

It is obvious that job-related voluntary separations last year decreased among junior and mid-level officers and increased among the clerical and female populations.

Inquiry was made of senior Directorate personnel officers who reported in general that they had very little direct contact with new employees. Most acknowledged the existence of component orientation mechanisms in their Directorates. These orientation programs vary greatly. The DDI and DDS&T have centralized orientation programs for all EOD's.

STATSPEC The DDI program is conducted every 6-8 weeks for four days and includes briefings by each office director or associate and walk-throughs of the Operations Center and parts of [] and OGCR. CRS runs an orientation course every two months for four days; [] and OGCR arrange individual division/ staff briefings; the other offices have no program as such, but OSR and OER distribute briefing books.

The DDS&T program runs for two days, three times a year, and the format is similar to the DDI's. NPIC, OSI and OTS have division/staff level briefings, the latter two for professional/technical only; OD&E provides its new secretaries with briefings on office procedures. OSI several years ago instituted a "buddy system" wherein the division chief designates a peer counselor for each new officer-level employee; that counselor is responsible for introducing the new member to source materials, valuable contacts, etc. The system supplements the supervisory relationship and has proven to be effective and appreciated.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

Within the DDA, several components have in-depth officer training programs which run for 3-9 months: OP, OL, OS and OF. OC and ODP do not have orientation programs, but provide required technical training. OTR conducts individual division briefings for professionals only. The OMS personnel office offers a briefing to new employees but nothing beyond that.

The DDO does virtually no orienting, but it must be noted that the vast majority of their professional assignees are not new Agency employees; they are most commonly Career Trainees, lateral entries, and reassignments from other occupational categories. ISG is the only component which conducts an orientation or briefing program for all assignees (10-12 at a time, as needed); they also distribute a brochure entitled, Survival Kit, to all EOD's. It seems to be effective.

The Office of Personnel conducts briefings for all EOD's on benefits, entitlements, etc. which are quite comprehensive. New clerical employees are given a brochure which serves as a reference for information previously imparted orally. OTR currently gives an hour long EOD briefing to clericals on Agency development, missions and functions, and organization. However, over two years ago OTR offered a 2-3 day formal orientation program on a variety of useful topics but it was discontinued. Most professional/technical employees attend OTR's Introduction to CIA Course within a year of EOD. All new employees are thoroughly indoctrinated by the Office of Security on security matters. Unfortunately, orientations of new employees are non-existent in some components, and clericals are the most neglected. This neglect is compounded by the fact that clerical employees are usually the least experienced, resourceful, and most bewildered of all new employees.

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PART ONE

1. Key Operating Officials. Assign to the Executive Advisory Group the responsibility to review nominations to fill senior openings (key operating officials), with such exceptions as the EAG may choose to designate, so that the DCI may be assured that selection of key managers has been made on an Agency-wide basis.
2. Assign the Deputy Directors and the Administrative Officer, DCI, the responsibility of notifying the EAG as soon as it is known that a key operating position will become vacant.
3. Separations. Direct supervisors to watch for and document indications of poor performance among employees in their probationary year and during the early years of Agency employment so that poor or mediocre employees are not encouraged to continue employment.
4. Direct the Office of Personnel in consultation with OGC to prepare a new consolidated regulation on the procedures to be followed for separation and on the bases for separation. The regulation should differentiate clearly among: separation for cause, involuntary retirement through failure to meet the required standard of performance (i.e. low ranking), involuntary retirement as surplus to the needs of the organization, and other forms of separation. It should specify criteria and procedures. Involuntary separation through failure to meet the required standard of performance should be based upon the combination of ranking and the descriptor assigned to the employee.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

All Directorates should use the same criteria as a basis for identification of employees who need counseling or other administrative assistance. A finding of low potential shall not be sufficient basis to place an employee in such a low percentile ranking. The appropriate low percentile (whether 3, 4 or 5 percent) shall be determined by the Office of Personnel. The primary purpose for identifying employees in the lowest percentile shall be counseling and improvement of performance; separation should be a last resort.

5. Rotation. The EAG should ask the Director of Personnel and appointed representatives from each of the Directorates to study the rotation system with an eye to making recommendations that would increase the role of planned rotations within the inter-Directorate movement now occurring. The study group should consider the availability of:

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

- ° instructing Career Services to designate a small number of positions to be filled through rotational assignment;
- ° asking OTR to devise a training program for officers designated to fill such positions;
- ° instructing Career Services to add to the PDP a list of officers who should participate in such rotational assignments.

The study group should consider means of increasing the amount of rotation for officers who would benefit, in addition to the use of rotational slots.

6. Promotions. The Director of Personnel, in consultation with the EAG, should issue guidance on promotion policy in the Agency in implementation of

25X1A

- ° Time-in-grade is a guideline to be considered but not a rigid requirement.
- ° Employees who give indication that they will be outstanding performers at higher levels of responsibility should not be constrained by time-in-grade.
- ° Outstanding performance at the existing level of performance should be given tangible recognition by such means as the Quality Step Increase and should be assessed carefully for indications that the employee can perform at a higher level of responsibility.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

- ° Career Services should publish more detailed statements of promotion policy that indicate the relative importance of factors that are the basis for selection. They should establish, on a continuing basis, the validity of these factors.
- ° To the extent possible, career tracks should be developed for substantive and functional specialists that need not force them into managerial responsibilities for advancement. The use of SPS, NIO and senior analyst positions provide such extensions of the substantive track.
- ° In view of the importance of specialist skills, the Career Services should assess ranking criteria to assure that they do not penalize the specialist in competition with generalists.
- ° In view of the emphasis placed on rotation, Career Services should review promotions to assure that employees on rotational assignment fare at least as well as those not on such assignment.

7. BEO. To monitor the new system employing Minority Coordinators, direct the Director of Personnel to continue monthly reports to the DDCI on progress in minority recruiting and placement, and send information copies to the Deputies.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

8. Proper Mix. Consider constituting the EAG on a quarterly basis as a manpower resources committee, with the Director of Personnel as advisor and with the full participation of the Comptroller, to consider manpower priorities and policies and to review the status of overall manpower resources. At these periodic meetings, the EAG should review special studies dealing with topics such as the balance of clerical and professional resources, line and support manpower, headquarters and field, the impact of changing program requirements on allocations within Agency ceiling.

9. The Comptroller should continue, with the assistance of the Director of Personnel and the Deputies, the current work to derive an inventory of the utilization and composition of the workforce.

10. Initial Assignment and Orientation. The EAG should examine the desirability of:

- ° Specifying that all supervisors of new employees (i.e., fewer than four years service with the Agency) should be rated on how well they provide on-the-job training and orientation.
- ° Establishing an exchange of information about orientation systems and procedures that have been used and appear to be effective.
- ° Directing the Director of Personnel, and supplying him the needed resources, to reinstate the Follow-up

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

Interview Programs to establish data and to provide analyses for management information and action as necessary by appropriate line managers.

- ° Directing OTR to submit recommendations (after completion of its current study) concerning the desirability of an indoctrination course for clerical employees within two to three months of EOD.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

PART TWO

Problem Areas Identified by the Employees

On the basis of the preliminary analysis of the returns from the employee attitude survey held during July-August 1976, a list of problem areas can be identified that has some overlap with the issues of the preceding section but also makes some significant additions. The employee responses are summarized in Table 3. The areas of concern emerge as: 1) adequacy of programs for career development; 2) the adequacy and fairness of procedures relating to selection for promotion and advancement; 3) dissemination of information concerning grievance procedures and employee rights; 4) opportunity for rotation among Directorates and within Directorates; 5) effective use of Letters of Instruction; 6) utilization of such forms of tangible recognition as Quality Step Increases; 7) confusion concerning circumstances and procedures concerning separation; 8) various external and internal factors affecting morale within the Agency; and, perhaps a major problem area, 9) the role, utilization and recognition of women.

As we have had so little time to process and analyze the survey results, we offer the following comments as a basis for consideration and further discussion. They do not represent the final product of full staff study.

TABLE 3

POSSIBLE PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED BY EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS
IN EMPLOYEE SAMPLING SURVEY JULY-AUGUST 1976

Career Development

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.A.</u>
11	Do you think that, overall, your Career Service is fulfilling its responsibilities in the area of career management?	32	26	41	1
12	Does your supervisor talk to you about your career development prospects?	40	4	53	3
17	Do you feel that your Career Service provides satisfactorily for employee career development needs?	29	28	42	1
	Women	(22)	33	44	1)
18	Do you feel your Career Service has been helpful in providing assistance on matters related to your career as an Agency employee?	28	18	51	3
	Women	(23)	19	53	5)
78	Do you feel your career is headed in a relatively clear direction in the Agency?	48	18	33	1
	Women	(39)	21	38	2)
79	Do you personally feel that greater attention given to your career planning by your Career Service would be beneficial?	64	15	19	2

Promotion and Advancement

30	Are you satisfied with your opportunities for promotion?	39	9	51	1
	Women	(33)	10	56	1)

CONFIDENTIAL

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.A.</u>
32	Do you think that promotions are given fairly in your Career Service (Career Subgroup) promotion system?				
	Women	34 (26)	30 33	35 40	1 1)
39	Do you know the criteria used to determine rankings on the competitive evaluation list (CEL) on which you are ranked?				
	Women	41 (29)	8 10	49 58	2 3)
75	Do you feel you have adequate opportunities for advancement within your Career Service?				
	Women	43 (31)	15 18	41 49	1 2)

Grievances

68	Do you know the procedures in your Career Service for handling grievances (not EEO issues)?	44	9	46	1
69	Are you satisfied with present Agency grievance procedures?	32	52	11	5
70	Are you confident you know what a grievance is?	62	13	25	0
71	Have you not taken action on a grievance because you thought to do so might work against your best interests or because you thought nothing would be done about it anyway?	25	5	55	15

Rotation

76	Is there adequate opportunity to transfer among the various Directorates in the Agency?	20	27	52	1
----	---	----	----	----	---

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.A.</u>
77	Is there adequate opportunity for rotational assignments to other positions in your Career Service?				
	Women	38 (26)	22 27	38 43	2 4)

Letters of Instruction

37	Has the LOI helped you to better understand your job?	40	11	43	6
----	---	----	----	----	---

Quality Step Increases

58	Does management make appropriate use of QSIs as a means of recognition?	29	25	45	1
----	---	----	----	----	---

Separation

72	Do you understand the difference between being declared "surplus" and being identified for "selection out"?	48	7	45	0
73	Do you understand how people in your Career Service are identified for selection out?	32	6	61	1
74	Do you understand the procedures where you work for declaring certain employees to be "excess to the manpower requirements of (their) Directorate or independent office"?	26	9	64	1

Morale

80	Do you feel that Agency morale has been negatively affected by external disclosures, e.g., Congressional Investigations?	59	9	32	0
----	--	----	---	----	---

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.A.</u>
82	Do you think the Agency's ability to fulfill the function in the near future (1-2 years) will be seriously hampered as a result of the Congressional Investigations?	44	18	38	0
84	Have these external pressures (investigations, disclosures, etc.) had any significant negative influence on your ability to do your job?	11	3	86	0
25X1A	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px;"></div>	16	3	81	0
		16	5	79	0

OTHER QUESTIONS WHERE WOMEN MAKE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT RESPONSE

27	Have you adequately utilized any additional training you may have acquired since your employment with the Agency?	66 (52)	8 8	16 23	10 17)
	Women				
29	Do you have adequate opportunity to gain experience and training for higher level work?	51 (41)	13 14	33 43	3 2)
	Women				
49	Do you believe better job opportunities on a fair, competitive basis have been denied you because of your sex?	11 (31)	6 12	74 54	9 3)
	Women				
67	Would you rate the following satisfactory at your job location?				
	Temperature	60 (44)	4 8	27 47	1 1)
	Women				

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

1. Adequacy of Programs for Career Development

From the response, it is clear that our employees expect more active roles to be played by their supervisors and their Career Services on career-related matters. What is less clear is how realistic is employee perception of the nature and objectives of Career Development Programs in the Agency. Is there an expectation that the employee's career is to be planned by someone else? In actual practice, our main thrust has been toward improved aggregate planning in the form of PDP and APP, improved counseling, and greater use of boards and panels for selection, but there has been very little practice of planning for the employee a roadmap for the future. Nor should there be. The employees need to understand the importance of their own assumption of initiative. Perhaps there is need for an Employee Bulletin on the subject, supplemented by notices from the individual Career Services.

2. Procedures Relating to Selection for Promotion and Advancement

Implementation of Recommendation 6 (preceding section) should provide some reassurance about the fairness of procedures.

3. Dissemination of Information Concerning Grievance Procedures and Employee Rights

As a rule, the Employee Handbooks provide the basic information, which is as available as any other information concerning personnel matters. Do the procedures themselves need strengthening? Employees express some doubt that action would be taken on a grievance case. The

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

EAG may wish a study of how many grievance cases have been recorded in a recent time period and what dispositions have been made. It is likely that such a study would be incomplete because there is no system for recording grievances processed at the component level.

4. Opportunity for Rotation

Implementation of Recommendation 5 (preceding section) should provide some increased opportunity for rotation and help to establish more realistic expectations concerning the likelihood and purposes of rotation.

5. Use of Letters of Instruction

Employee response to Letters of Instruction is quite mixed. The EAG may wish to review whether LOI's are performing the desired roles or whether steps can be taken to make them a more effective management tool.

6. Tangible Forms of Recognition, Such as Quality Step Increases

As part of Recommendation 6 (preceding section) it is suggested that outstanding performance at existing levels of responsibility should be given tangible recognition by such means as Quality Step Increases. (During CY 1975, ☐ QSI's were awarded.) Policy related to this should be reviewed and perhaps liberalized.

7. Circumstances and Procedures Concerning Separation

Recommendations 3 and 4 (preceding section) would provide for a necessary clarification concerning Agency policies and procedures with respect to separation.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010023-1

CONFIDENTIAL

8. Morale Within the Agency

The survey provides some basis for assessing the state of morale in the Agency. It will be augmented by a forthcoming survey of middle-level managers that will ask more detailed questions concerning their assessment of the state of morale. After completion of the second survey, the EAG may wish to consider the state of morale as a sole agenda item for a future meeting.

9. The Role, Utilization and Recognition of Women

In the responses to the employee survey, it is apparent that women as a group are significantly less happy with the state of the Agency than men. (See the breakout of women's responses to selected survey questions in Table 1.) In addition, we find that during FY 1975, there was an 18 percent increase in job-related separations of women while such separations of men decreased 18 percent. The reasons for these facts are complex and based on many factors, including the prevalence of secretarial/clerical work for our women employees, but as an organization, we cannot rest easy with this state of affairs. We are not alone in this problem. A corporate executive recently told the DDCI that this is emerging as a top problem in his corporation. The question is what action we can take to identify the key elements of the problem and to devise a positive plan of attack. As all Directorates are affected, it may be useful to establish a task force of Directorate representatives working with the Women's Coordinator and the Director of Personnel.